IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 9977 of 2004

For Approval and Signature:

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.K.BUCH

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : YES

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

MEHULBHAI BHAGWATIBHAI BHATT (BRAHMAN)

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 9977 of 2004

MR HR PRAJAPATI for Petitioner No. 1

MR MR PRAJAPATI for Petitioner No. 1

MS HB PUNANI, AGP for Respondent No. 1-3

RULE SERVED for Respondent No. 1-2

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.K.BUCH

Date of decision: 13/12/2004

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. Heard ld. counsel MR. Prajapati for the

petitioner detenu and ld. AGP Ms. HB Punani for the State. Affidavit-in-reply filed by Commissioner of Police, Ahmedabad City, tendered today by ld. AGP Ms. Punani is taken on record.

2. By this petition under Article 226 read with Articles 21 & 22(5) of the Constitution of India, the petitioner detenu has challenged the legality and validity of the order of detention dated 04.06.2004 passed by the Police Commissioner, Ahmedabad City, in exercise of the powers conferred on him by Section 3(2) of The Gujarat Prevention of Anti-Social Activities Act, 1985 (hereinafter referred to as the PASA Act) against the petitioner-detenu. The petitioner detenu has been branded as "boot-legger" as defined under Sec.2(b) of the PASA Act.

3. The grounds for detention supplied to the detenu petitioner indicate that the petitioner was found involved in solitary single offence punishable under Sections 66B, 65AE of the Bombay Prohibition Act being I.CR No. III 613/2004 registered with Prohibition Station (East). It is recorded by the authority that the petitioner is a "boot-legger" and is involved in the activities dangerous to the society.

4. The petitioner has challenged the legality and validity of the order of detention on number of grounds as mentioned in the memo of the petition. Ld. counsel Mr. Prajapati for the petitioner, has taken this Court through the contentions raised in the petition. However, he has focussed his arguments mainly on two grounds. The first ground pressed into service by ld. counsel Mr. Prajapti is that the petitioner has been wrongly branded as "bootlegger" and his activities are dangerous to maintenance of public order, as he was involved in solitary offence under Bombay Prohibition Act. The second ground pressed into service is that as per the settled legal position of the decision of the Apex Court in the case of Sohanlal Surajram Visnoi v/s State of Gujarat & Ors., 2004(2) GLR 1051, the impugned order of detention requires to be quashed as the case the present case is squarely covered by the ratio of the aforesaid decision.

5. I have gone through the above-cited decision. For the sake of convenience, I would like to quote relevant paras 4 & 5 of the said decision:-

"4. Article 22(3) of the Constitution of India expressly provides that the safeguards

contained in Art.22(1) and 22(2) of the Constitution are not to apply to preventive detention. Article 22(4) of the Constitution provides and opens with double negative, put in positive form, and in its real substance, means that a law which provides for preventive detention for a period longer than three months, shall contain all the provisions prescribed in clauses (4) and (5) of Article 22 of the Constitution. Article 22(5) of the Constitution prescribes that when any person under a preventive detention law is detained, the authority making the order, shall as soon as may be, communicate to such person, the grounds on which the order has been made, and shall afford him with the earliest opportunity of making a representation against the order. Article 22(5) of the Constitution is of general importance and operation in respect of every detention order made under any preventive detention law.

5. In this group of petitions, all the detenus, except one in Special Civil Application No.825 of 2003, are treated and described as "bootleggers" as defined under Sec.2(b) of the P.A.S.A. Act and only one offence is registered against each detenu under the provisions of the Bombay Prohibition Act, 1949. Whereas in Special Civil Application No.825/2003, the detenu is treated as "dangerous person" as defined in Sec.2(c) of the P.A.S.A. Act, and in this case also, a solitary incident is made basis for passing the detention order against him."

6. The next ground pressed into service by ld. counsel Mr. Prajapati is that the on the date of passing and execution of detention order i.e. on 04.06.2004, the detenu was in the custody in connection with the criminal case registered against him i.e. from 02.06.2004 when he came to be arrested. So, there was no need to pass order of preventive detention. In number of cases, this Court has consistently placed reliance on the ratio of the decision in the case of Amrutlal & Others v/s Union of India, Through Secretary, Ministry of Finance & Ors., AIR 2000 SC 3675 and has quashed the order of detention where detenu on the date of passing and/or execution of detention order, was either in judicial or in police custody. The reason that there is "likelihood to be released on bail", is different from "likelihood of his moving application for bail". In the cited decision, detenu was in custody. In these facts and circumstances,

ratio of the decision in the case of Vinod Singh V/s District Magistrate, Dhanbad, AIR 1986 SC 2090 also would help the present petitioner-detenu. So, on this ground also, the impugned order of detention requires to be quashed.

7. For the reasons aforesaid, this petition is allowed. Impugned order of detention dated 04.06.2004 passed by the Commissioner of Police, Ahmedabad City, is hereby quashed and set aside and detenu is hereby ordered to be set at liberty forthwith if he is not required to be detained in any other case. Rule is made absolute.

Direct Service is permitted.

[C. K.BUCH, J]

*rawal